DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 316 HE 025 287

AUTHOR Aigner, Jean S.; And Others
TITLE Internationalizing the University: Making It Work.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Change; Centralization; Change Strategies; College Faculty; Colleges; *Cooperative Planning; Curriculum Development; Foreign Students; Higher Education; *International Education; International Educational Exchange; *Organizational Change; Public Service; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Internationalism

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an agenda for "internationalizing" the university and discusses the operationalization of such an endeavor through efforts in the following areas: administration; faculty and curriculum; foreign study and international exchanges; foreign students and scholars; technical cooperation and international development; and public service. Each area is detailed in terms of actions necessary to internationalize the university as well as the inherent difficulties that each action possesses. Success in "internationalizing" efforts is seen to depend on service, coordination, cooperation, and small-scale change, and the reasons for each are discussed. Finally, examples are provided of methods various universities have used to handle internationalization of their campuses, including the strategies employed; the organizational structures that were developed; and innovative plans and recommendations involving curriculum, faculty, study abroad, and exchange efforts. Contains a 20-item bibliography. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED342316

Internationalizing the University: Making It Work

Jean S. Aigner, Ph.D.
International Affairs
University of Nebraska

Patricia Nelson, Ed.D.
Continuing Education
University of Nebraska

Joseph R. Stimpfl, Ph.D.
International Affairs
University of Nebraska

HE 025 287

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph R. Stimpfl

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Internationalizing the University: Making It Work

Jean S. Aigner, Ph.D.
International Affairs
University of Nebraska

Patricia Nelson, Ed.D.
Continuing Education
University of Nebraska

Joseph R. Stimpfl, Ph.D.
International Affairs
University of Nebraska

Defining the importance of international education and "internationalizing" is a simple matter, at least in the abstract. We all seem to envision the same rough outline for "internationalization." This outline includes a significant body of knowledge and a number of initiatives to aid in the analysis and understanding of other ways of doing, knowing and thinking. The Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies (CAFLIS) has suggested that "internationalization" may be approached through the development of knowledge and understanding of other societies and of the connections of the modern global society. This should lead us to comprehend other cultural perspectives and make informed decisions on complex international issues. For those who support broadening post-secondary education with a global dimension, there is little argument on these "conceptualizations," but from that point on, when we approach the subject of an agenda, there are significant differences of opinion.

The variation of opinion, roughly speaking, can be divided into three distinct orientations: an emphasis on questions of international security, a fear of the loss of economic competitiveness, and a desire to foster human understanding across national boundaries. These classifications are not absolute or mutually exclusive, but invariably, we, as political and social creatures, must choose a major orientation. Although these orientations may agree on strategy, they often disagree on content and emphasis. There must be room for all in any successful university wide movement toward "internationalization."

Efforts to promote international education are often divided into the following emphases: strengthening the international dimension across the curriculum, expanding international exchanges, building a system for cooperation in development, both locally and internationally, and supporting research on issues with international significance. Factors often cited that may help effect internationalization are foreign language and area studies, curriculum reform with an international focus, study abroad programs, international internships, foreign students, faculty exchanges, international research projects, inter-institutional cooperative relationships, development projects, international activities at the university, faculty development in international context, aid to the private sector in international projects, and financial support for international activities.

Problems arise when it comes to operationalizing "internationalization;" to planning what is to be done. In considering these problems, we will use a common framework for effecting a new "international" orientation. The Association of

International Education Administrators suggests that "internationalization" may be operationalized by affecting the following areas: (1) administration; (2) faculty and curriculum; (3) foreign study and international exchanges; (4) foreign students and scholars; (5) technical cooperation and international development; (6) public service. This framework is practical and invigorating. It offers a thoughtful approach. But it is wrought with difficulties. We will examine each of these areas in detail, with the difficulties that are inherent in each.

1. **Administration.** *A university needs a high profile administrator to act as a leader. The university must foster faculty participation and add an interdisciplinary focus. New avenues of communication must be credited, along with increased levels of funding, and a clear statement of mission and goals.*

These ends are not easily reached. For example, leadership is earned, not appointed. It requires appropriate rhetoric from the chief academic officers to reiterate the internationalist goals and objectives of the institution. Leadership may also connote centralization of authority, not a popular end in the traditional university college and departmental structure. Monetary and other incentives can sometimes overcome inherent fears. Funding is another difficult question. Money for "educational goals" rather than programs is usually fragmented between departments and colleges, not centralized with the chief international education administrator. If funding for "internationalization" is a line item in departmental budgets, it is always in danger of red-lining or deletion unless, in the best of all situations, it is part of the budget for which a sympathetic chief academic officer is responsible.

Interdisciplinary studies are always problematic. The unfortunate fact is that interdisciplinary study, although praised in consideration, is often considered marginal. It is frequently distributed between departments and under-supported. "Large universities are by necessity organized on departmental and school lines--each with a core view of its mission--and with little mechanism for filling the gaps between disciplines" (Wilkins, 1988). The unfortunate reality of universities is that funding and administrative priorities are often internally directed. The pressures on administrations to construct relevant mission and goals statements allows little room for attention outside the immediate American and regional context. Even where rhetoric, a high profile administrator, and modest funding are available, neither the articulated nor practiced reward structure or hiring practices deliberately support the internationalization agenda. Yet, these are of fundamental importance.

2. Faculty and Curriculum. *The institutional goal should be to develop the international dimension of each academic discipline. General education requirements should include an international component. Faculty should be rewarded for activities, teaching and research with an international focus. Curriculum change should have a multidisciplinary focus.*

The normal structure of the university inhibits, if not precludes, the application of these ideas. While not impossible, it is difficult for deans of colleges to prescribe departmental activities, let alone any unit of administration external to that dean's college. Furthermore, policy will be translated at the discretion of the faculty, at least second, if not third hand. Aggressive hiring and strategies for internationalization are not a priority for most deans. Creating new coursework along traditional lines to

correct a perceived shortcoming in student understanding has often proven to be inefficient, if not unlikely. When existing coursework is made to serve this purpose, it is nearly impossible. New courses, and significantly revised courses and curricula with an interdisciplinary focus, must be developed. This is no easy task when the need for a "core curriculum" is hotly debated by many. Curriculum change is always difficult because of the prohibitive nature of the expense and time commitment for course development. These concerns are exacerbated by the common reward structure of a university which pointedly directs young faculty away from international involvement. Career rewards, hiring, and financial/administrative support are absolutely necessary to drive internationalization and to convincingly portray it as an institutional goal and direction.

3. Foreign Study and International Exchanges. *Foreign study should be included in the academic goals of the university. International programming should be addressed in long-range university planning. Such programming should be carefully monitored and evaluated. The university should also provide advising and financial support for students in international programs.*

The foremost difficulty in this area is funding. All of the above services will consume university resources. They demand the time and attention of staff members often assigned other duties with higher priorities. Study abroad and exchange programs usually originate in departments and are often very narrow in focus. Broadening the focus of a program requires the cooperation of the staff and the attention of a staff member in a central administrative office. It is critical that study abroad be integrated into existing curricula and requirements, and advocated by

faculty advisors--no mean feats. Evaluation, to be successful, requires a formal and common process. This centralization of evaluation, both at the student and program level, demands the cooperation of faculty who usually have many competing demands on their time. A further inhibition to the foreign study emphasis is the difficulty in developing new programs and exchanges. Internally created programs are the most successful, but they require a great deal of lead time. For every successful program, there are probably three other unsuccessful programs either eliminated in the planning stages or abandoned in implementation. Incentives for study abroad are central to promoting institutional support of international educational experiences, integrating study abroad programs and internationalization across the curriculum, and gaining faculty support for and ownership of internationalization.

4. Foreign Students and Scholars. *A university needs a clear statement of purpose that defines the reasons for enrolling foreign students. It needs to provide professional support for these students. The foreign student population should reflect diversity and balance. Foreign students should be used as a resource. Foreign teaching assistants should be given adequate support. Foreign students returning home should be asked to maintain contact with the university and should be prepared for the inevitable difficulties of returning to their own culture.*

Foreign students are a fictive group. There is no typical foreign student. There are students from China, students from Australia, students from Malaysia and students from France. They are also graduates and undergraduates, studying business, engineering, math, computer science and a host of other subjects. They come according to their interests and often arrive at their specific university through a series

of coincidences. The university cannot control those coincidences nor can it control the world market. The number of students from any specific country can vary radically according to the fluctuations of the world economic market and their own government support. Few institutions have policies which promote balance in the international student body across disciplines. Foreign students may also be offered a myriad of services but, like all students, they cannot be forced to participate or take advantage of these services. Foreign students are a resource only if they can be convinced of the utility and personal benefit of that role. Students spending huge amounts of money to attend a foreign university often have little interest in programs that benefit the university. Nonetheless, there are certain minimum levels of support institutions simply must provide if they expect to enroll international students and support viable international exchanges. Institutions should also consider plans to balance foreign student enrollments in regard to affirmative action policies. Administrative expectations must be tempered by economic reality.

5. Technical Cooperation and International Development. *The university should have a clear rationale for involvement in international development programs, even to departmental levels. The institution must foster and support such projects. The faculty must support and be involved in these activities. Faculty must be adequately prepared for such activities, and the expertise that they garner should be integrated into university activities and programs.*

Outside of agriculture programs, the idea of direct university involvement in development issues is rather new. University departments and colleges have usually had their involvement solicited by government agencies and non-governmental

organizations (NGOs). Departments and individual faculty have participated in development work that varies radically in the application of development theory. Little attention has been paid to models and consistency. If the new orientation of the United States Agency for International Development and the direction of President Bush to move away from "micro-management" are followed, universities may be required to make university-wide decisions on the type of development projects with which they wish to be involved. However, until the prospectus for funding changes, university participation will remain fragmented and inconsistent. If a university-wide policy is to be followed, criteria for hiring new faculty, reviewing faculty professional development/sabbatical proposals, and the reward structure will need to clearly reflect the seriousness of the institution's commitment to technical cooperation and international development.

6. **Public Service**. *The goals of the university must be based on mutual benefits for the surrounding community. This requires that the university identify the regional or local constituencies and assess the resources available, both to itself and the community, that may be used to accomplish broader based internationalization. All the members of the university should be encouraged to participate in community activities through incentives in the reward structure.*

Unfortunately, public and community service often holds a very low priority at the university. To encourage individual participation of faculty, staff and students in community affairs is difficult, regardless of the stated concerns or goals of the university. Creating incentives to get faculty involved will cost money or will be perceived as detracting from the vital work of faculty in departments and disciplines.

There is also the assumption that local communities have one identity. They are at least as fragmented as the university. There is seldom a consensus. Incorporation of some constituencies in programs inevitably leads to exclusion of others. Therefore, the town-gown relationship and partnerships among educators, both in the public and private sectors, become fundamentally important if internationalization is to have a broad base of support and external advocacy.

The most basic difficulty in adopting any "internationalization" plan is the normal structure of the university itself, which neither lends itself to sweeping reform nor centralized coordination. The exclusive top down model just doesn't work. "Internationalization" must be defined in the broadest context, marshalling all disparate interests and points of view. No one agenda can be espoused or the result is limited impact, based on exclusion and a hierarchy of interests.

A university tends to emphasize activities rather than impacts. We see a problem, we offer a course, we hold a meeting or we plan an event. This is not done to effect an end but as a response to a stimulus. Any planning to affect or effect must be integrated. Furthermore, responses are usually controlled by a fixed agenda. It has become increasingly difficult in the context of the modern American university to formulate an activity that does not imply a set of norms, acceptance of which may be a pre-condition for participation. If you want to be involved, you must have the "correct political thinking" or appropriate social behavior. Those who truly wish to affect the widest ranging and most effective change toward an international orientation cannot afford to participate in this manner.

In the face of these concerns, "internationalization" needs to be organized and directive. It needs to be "proactive" not "reactive." It needs to identify and mobilize constituencies while avoiding membership in any one exclusive category. There must be a broad agenda. It needs to coordinate support, to build bridges, to arbitrate and to mediate. It needs to raise the public consciousness of global issues. It needs to define exchange in a broad-based model that does not ignore the community.

Success in "internationalizing" efforts will depend on four things: **service**, **coordination**, **cooperation** and **small-scale change**. Administrators who hope to effect change must prove their worth and worthiness through service to faculty, students and the community outside the university. This service must be submissive, supportive and readily available. Service is no threat. It does not depend on or demand power. And it inevitably leads to support. Cooperation is essential. Administrators who lead in the drive for internationalization will need to cooperate with existing university structures, even in cases when such structures may be less than perfect. Different models and programs will evolve with time. Administration must facilitate networking among faculty. It cannot afford, ever, to challenge traditional disciplines. Interdisciplinary cooperation can be fostered by cooperation; it cannot be created. International administrators must "allow" faculty to be interdisciplinary, not "demand" it by creating an artificial interdisciplinary emphasis.

Despite an orientation toward service and support, the persons charged with the task of internationalizing must also act, both officially and unofficially, to coordinate efforts. The administrative leadership must network information, consolidate effort and

lead the disparate elements of the university in a coordinated effort to facilitate change.

The most important aspect to internationalizing the university, however, is small-scale change. No matter what mission and goals statements say, no matter what power is invested in a given administrator, no matter how pressing or good an idea may be, change can and will occur only in small increments, little by little. The grand effect, the revolution, is accomplished in small steps. Internationalization will be measured in successful programs: cooperative grants, model courses, small amounts of funding for worthy efforts, instances of cooperation, demands for service, a responsive structure for internationalization. Success will be reflected in the number of programs carried out, not in the effect of one. This in no way precludes centralized planning. Internationalization is a cumulative effort over time. We must be patient and congratulate ourselves for small successes.

There are many examples of successful internationalization efforts which provide leadership for a serious and sustained change to an international orientation for institutions of higher education. Most of the efforts reported follow a familiar pattern. An institution decides to internationalize, task forces and advisory councils are appointed, recommendations are made, funding is sought, decisions are implemented, administrative offices are sometimes restructured, and efforts to address curriculum are undertaken. There is often a hope to create a general sense of purpose and a coherent movement throughout the entire institution with the success of

efforts ultimately depending on being firmly incorporated into the structure of the institution.

Historically, success has been related to developing the international dimension on campus by addressing administrative needs and by restructuring the responsibilities for international affairs into a central office. At the University Pennsylvania State, organizational restructuring of the University office of International Programs as a strategic planning unit on nine par with the eleven other colleges and the naming of an advisory council catalyzed staff and led to the development of a clear university-wide mission. Each academic unit has been charged to incorporate in consultation and collaboration with the University Office of International Programs an agenda of International activities and programs (Koff, 1987).

At the University of Iowa, efforts to make "international" central to its mission have included coordinating all international activities thorough the Office of International Affairs. Some of the components of the international dimension include a major effort to involve more American students in study abroad programs, continuing to enroll a large number of foreign students on campus (over 2,500 students representing over 121 countries), participating in the Iowa Peace Institute which hosts numerous foreign delegations, and working closely with the Iowa Sister-State agreements with Mexico, Japan, Malaysia, the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union. Iowa also has a Friendships International Program which involves an 18-member task force which directs the training and pairing of foreign students with Iowa families. The Technology and Social Change Program responsible to the Office

of International Affairs conducts interdisciplinary courses and has produced two publications as a spin-off, "Studies in Technology & Social Change" and "Bibliographies in Technology & Social Change" (Christensen, 1988).

The University of Oregon has moved from a highly decentralized model of administering its international programs to the creation of a centralized Office of International Affairs headed by a Vice-Provost. Reporting to the Vice-provost are all academic programs that are both International in nature and cross-disciplinary or cross-college in scope. Among these are eight area studies programs and several research centers. A number of mechanisms have been developed to help internationalize all aspects of the institution. These include a planning process in which all departments, colleges and interdisciplinary have developed long-range plans, placing a priority on the development of "central faculty positions" such as allocating two positions to strengthen Pacific Studies programs, requiring all new hires in the College of Business Administration to have international expertise as part of their portfolio, and to continue collaborative relationships with other institutions which have areas of international strength (Bownan, 1990).

In contrast to administrative centralization, a more diffusionist strategy may increase international activity on a campus by distributing responsibilities among a wide network of offices, departments, and people. The University of Iowa's Office of International Education and Services, for example, also includes a "diffusionist" structure as a foundation for much of their work. The Office of Alumni Affairs and the Admissions Office are examples of two of five university offices who have staff

members actively collaborating with the Office of International Education on one of many interface committees. Other diffusionist strategies include 14 graduate students who work with the Iowa Office funded from multiple sources and the creation of committees to focus on faculty interests about particular foreign countries or universities (Arum, 1988). The University of Nebraska-Lincoln has created a program to balance centralization and decentralization. Each department throughout the University has a "faculty liaison" to facilitate the flow of information on international topics and encourage the involvement of faculty and students. Planned programs include support grants for course globalization and discipline specific workshops to aid faculty in curricular revision. The benefits of continuing such decentralized efforts are the extra energy, resources and expertise that come form the involvement of as diverse a number of populations as possible.

In the important areas of faculty and curriculum, foreign study and foreign student and scholar exchange, the state of Texas has perhaps identified the most extensive agenda for it's educational institutions. The international agenda proposed for higher education institutions in the state of Texas as detailed in a recent report "Texas in the 21st Century, The International Agenda, "January 1991," identifies seven recommendations to position colleges and universities as key partners in a new international agenda. These include requiring cross-cultural studies as part of the core college curriculum, establishing a $5 million fund for international education projects, integrating study abroad programs into regular courses, establishing new institutes and centers for graduate research, establishing scholarships for foreign language learning

and scholarly exchange, and developing collaborative relationships with school districts to maintain a study of foreign language and culture from kindergarten through college (Texas Committee for Humanities Report to the Governor 1987).

Other institutions of higher education have initiated innovative recommendations and plans which include curriculum, faculty, study abroad and exchange efforts. The California State University, Long Beach, has organized a sequence of learning strategies necessary for internationalizing the Health Science curriculum. According to Forouzesh and Gunatilake (1990), "faculty should ask three basic questions in internationalizing their courses: What to teach, How to teach, and Where to go to secure appropriate instructional resources." As part of the competency requirement for the California program, students are also required to take a Spanish language course and participate in international education activities on campus such as developing a week-long program for the campus wide international fair as well as taking part in study abroad programs and workshops (Forouzesh, Gunatilake 1990).

Worcester Polytechnic Institute has an innovative study-abroad program which adds an international dimension to the education of American engineers. The Global Project is unique in that it links international education to a service-learning project that is a degree requirement for every WPI student. The service learning provided by the Global Project pertains to the application of science and technology to the social needs of already developed countries. Projects cover a wide range of topics from health care and housing to solar power and transportation. Students involved in service learning act in a professional capacity for corporate and government bodies,

where they must function in a new culture (Council on Internet Education Exchange, Education for Global Competence 1988).

Historically black colleges and universities have also been concerned international partnerships. Alabama A&M University, Florida A&M University and the University of Maryland Eastern Shore are all institutions that have forged overseas linkages and collaborative agreements with African nations. These institutional linkages are a critical component of the international efforts of American higher education institutions. Many of these colleges have collaborated with African governments to improve African economies through agricultural research programs, most of them sponsored by United States Agency for International Development. Participant trainees who graduate from these colleges become international alumni who can recruit family and friends to study at the campuses, identify overseas work experiences and promote exchanges which both assist the country and the university (Hytche, 1990).

Individual university efforts to internationalize have been augmented by the support of American college associations such as the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business Association of American Colleges. This Association has recognized the "the International Dimension in U.S. Higher Education" through a 1988 conference on New Directions In Business School/Liberal Arts Cooperation. Taking as points of departure the ideas and insights provided by three plenary addresses, groups of scholars from business schools and liberal arts developed suggestions for promoting interdisciplinary work with an international focus. Ideas

included promoting joint academic appointments, conducting seminars for faculty across disciplinary boundaries, developing interdisciplinary courses with an international focus, i.e., international business history and international business ethics. Richard Wood, president of Earlham College and a member of the conference advisory committee noted that "a focus on international concerns will be corrective to ethnocentrism in research which will benefit business problems which are often interdisciplinary and multicultural in nature" (Spalding, 1988).

The area of technical cooperation and international development is another highly important interface addressed within most institutions. Linkages between development education and international education are being examined in conferences such as one headed by Steven Arnold, Director of the International Development Program at the American University in Washington. Other campuses such as Michigan State University have engaged in on-campus cooperative efforts between the office of International Studies and Programs and scholars interested in international development. For example, faculty and students at Michigan State University meet over lunch in the MSU International Center to hear about projects, organizations, ideas and issues in international development. The Friday luncheons are a tradition at MSU and have been incorporated into the activities of the Lansing area chapter of the Society for International Development (SID). The Office of International Studies and Programs provides an "institutional home" for many association activities such as Hunger Awareness Week, and the SID Development Education Workshop. (Scarlett, 1990).

All of these institutions provide examples of the many options that exist for internationalization. Clearly the creation of an internationalized curriculum and supportive infrastructure are part of an incremental process. This process will occur within the context of the individual institution's history and their existing priorities. By the same token, these examples define in a real way the successful efforts made by many institutions toward effective internationalization.

The real and pressing problems of internationalization are expansive and common. International administrators are not excluded from "turf battles." If anything, we are more in the thick of it than anyone else. We must also deal with a faculty who are limited by concerns of promotion and often see the world in the same limited scope as those outside the university. We must suffer the problem of a plethora of international activities that have little common orchestration. We must observe and tolerate the inevitable disciplinary prejudice of faculty and departments. We must deal with the disassociation of the university from its support community. We must tolerate the fragmented nature of university research and the disjointed structure of its intellectual activities. Despite problems, there are many evidences of our success. Our efforts are showing great dividends. However, universities cannot afford to be satisfied with these successes. We must push on towards more and better adaptations and changes.

Bibliography

Arum, Stephen, "The Case for Diffusion in the Development of International Education," Journal of the Association of International Education Administrators. 8: 12-16 (Spring 1988).

Association of International Education Administrators, "Guidelines for International Education at U.S. Colleges and Universities," Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), 1987.

Bennett, W.F., and J.S. Behrens, "A Course on the Reentry and Transition of International Students," Journal of the Association of International Education Administrators. 8: 17-20 (Spring 1988).

Bowman, Kathleen, "A Strategy for Internationalization: The University of Oregon," International Education Forum. 10.1: 9-13 (Spring 1990).

Christensen, George C., "An Overview of One University's Efforts to Make 'International' Central to Its Mission," Journal of the Association of International Education Administrators. 8: 69-77 (Fall 1988).

Council on International Educational Exchange, Educating for Global Competence. New York: C.I.E.E., 1988.

Fata, Frank, "When Interdisciplinary Becomes International," Phi Beta Delta International Review. 1: 25-34 (January 1990).

Forouzesh, Mohammed, and Sarath Gunatilake, "Teaching Ideas and Strategies in International Health," Phi Beta Delta International Review. 1: 1-10 (January 1990).

Hytche, William P. "Historically Black Institutions Forge Linkages With African Nations," Educational Record. 71.2: 19-21 (Spring 1990).

InterAction Development Education Committee, et al. "Conference to Explore Linking Global and Development Education," Ideas and Information About Development Education. 18: 1 (Winter 1991).

"Internationalizing U.S. Universities: A Time for Leadership," conference proceedings, Spokane, Washington: June 5-7, 1990.

Jernigan, Charles, "Internationalizing the Curriculum of California's Undergraduates," Phi Beta Delta International Review. 1: 11-24 (January 1990).

Kopp, W. LaMarr, "Developing the International Dimension on Campus: A Case Study of the Pennsylvania State University," Journal of the Association of International Education Administrators. 7: 24-26 (Spring 1987).

Lambert, Richard, "International Studies and the Undergraduate," Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989.

McCulloch, Wendell H., Jr. "Interdisciplinary Internationalization of Business Schools," Phi Beta Delta International Review. 1: 35-44 (January 1990).

Scarlett, Doris, "The SID Tradition at MSU," SID-USA Newsletter. (Winter 1990): 9ff.

Spalding, Jane R., "Internationalizing Higher Education Through Business School/ Liberal Arts Education" Conference proceedings, The International Dimension in U.S. Higher Education: New Directions in Business School / Liberal Arts Cooperation, 13-15 June 1988. Montvale, New Jersey: 2-5.

Texas Committee for the Humanities, "Texas in the 21st Century-The International Agenda: A Report to the Governor and the Texas Legislature," Austin, Texas; 1987.

Wilkins, Mira, "Economic Historians, Their Interdisciplinary Nature and Dilemmas." conference proceedings, Internationalizing Higher Education through Business School/Liberal Arts Cooperation, June 13-15, 1988.

Yucas, Annagene, and Burkart Holzner, "New Forms in International Programs for U.S. Higher Education," Journal of the Association of International Education Administrators. 8: 39-41 (Spring 1988).